

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-9, and 13 are pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

### Amendment

Claim 2 has been canceled and independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. In this respect, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to incorporate claim 2 and to further define the display size control aspect set forth on page 21, lines 14-17, namely displaying the more recently selected data at a larger video area than the previously selected data, which is displayed at a smaller video area. Independent claims 5 and 13 have been amended substantially as suggested by the examiner during the interview, namely more clearly setting forth how the operational panel window for the main video window is displayed in comparison to the operational panel window for the subsidiary video windows. No new matter has been introduced.

### Art Rejection & Interview

Claims 5, 6, 8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz (USP 6,476,858) in view of Bormann (USP 6,664,985). Claims 1, 2, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz in view of Martinez (USP 6,111,575), Cecco (USP 6,310,631), and Bormann. Lastly, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz in view of Bormann and Ishida (USP 5,684,969).

Applicant thanks the examiner granting a telephonic interview, which was held on July 14, 2008. During the interview Bormann in particular was discussed in detail. The examiner clarified that Bormann was merely relied for the proposition that displaying windows or GUI at different window sizes, each with a different degree of contents would have been obvious regardless of the contents, particularly in light of the *KSR* case. Moreover, the examiner explained that Ramirez Diaz already discloses the feature of claim 2.

Based on the interview, without conceding that the combination would have been obvious or even tenable, in the interest of expediting allowance, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to incorporate the sizing feature set forth on page 21, lines 14-17. Specifically, these claims now call for displaying a more recently selected digital video data at a larger display area than a previously selected video data, which is displayed at a smaller display area. That is, the more recent the selected digital video data is, the larger it is displayed. That

is, the previously selected digital video data is displayed at a smaller video window. Applicant submit that the combination would not have disclosed or taught this aspect of claims 1 and 9.

As to independent claims 5 and 13, the undersigned explained that neither Ramirez Diaz nor Bormann would have disclosed displaying the operation panel window for the main video window in more detail than any of the operational panel windows for the subsidiary video windows. The examiner, however, believes that the language "in more detail" needs to be clarified. In this respect, these claims have been further defined, similarly using the language set forth in claim 7, namely displaying more operating buttons in the operation panel window for the main video window than in the operation panel window for the subsidiary video windows. Applicant submits that the combination would not have disclosed or taught this aspect of claims 5 and 13. Note also that these claims have been further revised to clarify a plurality of subsidiary video windows all having different window sizes, with an operation panel window for the main video window and at least one operation panel window for the subsidiary video windows.

#### Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

25 JULY 2008

DATE

/Lyle Kimms 072508/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)